

Appl. No. 10/550,056  
Amendment dated: November 5, 2008  
Reply to OA of: June 5, 2008

### **REMARKS**

Applicants have amended the specification and claims to more particularly define the invention taking into consideration the outstanding Official Action. Applicants have amended claims 1, 2 and 15 and have added new claims 16-21 to the present application. Applicants submit that all of the claims now present in the application are fully supported by the specification as originally filed and no new matter is introduced.

The objection to the disclosure for the reasons set forth on page 2 of the outstanding Official Action has been obviated in view of the amendments to the specification. Applicants have cross-referenced the related applications in the specification as requested by the Examiner. However, the Examiner's attention is most respectfully directed to MPEP § 1893.03(c) which states on page 1800-200, lower left column, that, "Accordingly, it is not necessary for the applicant to amend the first sentence of the specification to reference the international application number..." Accordingly, it is most respectfully requested that this objection be withdrawn.

The objection to claim 15 under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim 1, which is a method claim has been obviated in view of the amendment to the claim. Claim 15 has been amended to be an independent claim. Accordingly, it is most respectfully requested that this objection be withdrawn.

Applicants most respectfully submit that all of the claims now present in the application are in full compliance with 35 USC 112 and clearly patentable over the references of record.

The rejection of claims 1 and 12 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al. has been carefully considered but is most respectfully traversed in view of the amendments to the claims and the following comments.

Appl. No. 10/550,056  
Amendment dated: November 5, 2008  
Reply to OA of: June 5, 2008

The purpose of Tanaka et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,780,490) is to provide a tray which meets the requirements for carrying magnetic heads for magnetic disks and which are less likely to cause electrical damage due to electrostatic discharge.

The tray of Tanaka et al is produced by molding a conductive thermoplastic resin composition containing a conductive loading material to prevent the tray from suffering electrical damage. Although the cut surfaces of the tray of Tanaka et al can be prevented from causing electrical damage, this is due to the conductive loading materials which are contained into a conductive thermoplastic resin composition to be formed into the tray by molding. In other words, the base material of the tray of Tanaka et al has the inherent conductive property due to the conductive loading materials. Therefore if a portion of the tray is cut, the portion does not lose the conductive property.

On the other hand, the purpose of the present invention is to provide a method of providing a desired range of point-to-ground resistance to trays, by coating the polymer film with a conductive solution to prepare a conductive sheet having an antistatic layer thereon, forming a tray having cut surfaces with the conductive sheet, and by forming a conductive pathway on all, or parts, of the cut surfaces of the tray.

Since the tray used in the present invention could be made of the normal polymer sheet without the conductive property, the polymer sheet should be coated with a conductive solution so that the tray obtains the conductive property. In case a portion of the tray is cut, the portion does not have the conductive property. This is further emphasized in amended claim 2 which is fully supported by the specification, see page 3, lines 18 and 19. Therefore the purpose of the present invention, as would be appreciated by one of ordinary skill in the art is to provide a conductive pathway on all, or parts, of the cut surfaces of the tray.

Trays for carrying electronic parts are usually produced by using the polymer films coated with the antistatic layer to have the antistatic property. However, the films are cut to be formed into trays, and the trays will have cut portions. Although the

Appl. No. 10/550,056  
Amendment dated: November 5, 2008  
Reply to OA of: June 5, 2008

antistatic layer has conductive property, electrons may be charged at the cut portions. The charged electrons can damage electronic parts placed into the tray. The present invention prevents electrons discharge from damaging the electronic parts in the tray having the cut portions which are produced using the film. In other words, the method of providing a desired range of point-to ground resistance to trays according to the present invention is not made for the tray of Tanaka et al that is produced by molding a conductive thermoplastic resin composition containing a conductive loading material, as the inventors revealed in the background art (page 2, lines 11-21; page 3, lines 12-23).

Tanaka et al does not teach to make a conductive pathway between the separated antistatic layers on both sides of the conductive sheet, due to cutting the sheet in accordance with the presently claimed invention. The solution in Tanaka is to load the conducting material into the resin composition used to form the tray. On the contrary, the present invention does not use such loading and provides an entirely different and unobvious solution to the problem associated with the cut surfaces of coating the cut surfaces in accordance with the claimed invention.

In conclusion, a person having ordinary skill in the arts can not make a method of providing a desired range of point-to ground resistance to trays formed with a polymer sheet having antistatic layer on the both sides thereof from Tanaka et al. Accordingly, it is most respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 2-11 and 13 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al. in view of Applicants' Admitted Prior Art has been carefully considered but is most respectfully traversed in view of the amendments to the claims and the above comments. Accordingly, it is most respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/550,056  
Amendment dated: November 5, 2008  
Reply to OA of: June 5, 2008

In view of the above comments and further amendments to the specification and claims, favorable reconsideration and allowance of all the claims now present in the application are most respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC

By:   
Richard E. Fichter  
Registration No. 26,382

625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
Phone: (703) 683-0500  
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080  
REF/cjw  
A01.wpd  
November 5, 2008